

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 24-11116-UA**Date **January 30, 2025**Title ***Arjun Vasan v. Checkmate.com Inc., et al.***Page **1 of 1**Present: The Honorable **DOLLY M. GEE, CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE****DEREK DAVIS**

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)
None Present

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO STRIKE [5]

On December 23, 2024, Plaintiff Arjun Vasan, who proceeds *pro se*, filed a complaint, but he failed to pay the required filing fee or, alternatively, submit a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. [Doc. # 1.] As a result, judges were not assigned to the case and the Clerk’s Office notified Vasan that, within 30 days, he must either pay the filing fee or submit a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* or his case would be dismissed. [Doc. # 2.] On January 22, 2025, Vasan filed two notices of dismissal dismissing the action in its entirety without prejudice, and the case was closed. [See Doc. ## 3, 4.] The dismissal was effective without a court order as Defendants had not served an answer or motion for summary judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1).

Vasan has also filed a motion to strike the complaint. [Doc. # 5 (“Mot.”).]¹ Vasan asserts the complaint was inadvertently filed and contains materials that Vasan does not wish to be part of the court record. *Id.* at 2. Vasan seeks to strike the complaint to avoid any unnecessary confusion or prejudice and requests expedited review of his motion. *Id.* Striking the complaint is largely redundant as Vasan has dismissed the action in its entirety. Nonetheless, good cause appearing due to Vasan’s representation regarding the inadvertent mistake and prompt request to strike, the Court **GRANTS** the motion. The complaint is **HEREBY STRICKEN**. The case shall remain closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹ Vasan refers to the document that he seeks to strike as the “document filed on December 26, 2024, titled ‘*Arjun Vasan v. Checkmate.com Inc. et al.*’” Mot. at 1. (All page references herein are to page numbers inserted by the CM/ECF system.) Although the complaint was filed on December 23, not December 26, the Court presumes Vasan is referring to the complaint.